

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 19, 2006. No amendments have been made in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims 1-32 are respectfully requested.

**I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

**A. Statement of the Rejection**

Claims 1-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by *Necoechea et al.* (“*Necoechea*,” U.S. Pat. No. 6,560,756). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**B. Discussion of the Rejection**

It is axiomatic that “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration.” *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the present case, not every claimed feature is represented in the *Necoechea* reference. Applicant discusses the *Necoechea* reference and Applicant’s claims in the following.

## Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites (with emphasis added):

1. A method for adaptively compressing test data to be provided to a device under test (DUT), the method comprising the steps of:
  - examining a test data file that includes a first plurality of data units corresponding to a first plurality of DUT pins and a second plurality of data units corresponding to a second plurality of DUT pins;
  - compressing the first plurality of data units using a first compression technique; and*
  - compressing the second plurality of data units using a second compression technique.*

Applicant respectfully submits that *Necoechea* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the above-emphasized features. The Office Action makes reference (page 3) to elements 201 and 202 of Figure 2 of *Necoechea* for respective compressing features found in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully notes that 201 and 202 of *Necoechea* are blocks describing the “reception” of compressed test pattern data, and not the compression of data units as described in claim 1. Further, *Necoechea* is devoid of any enabling disclosure with regard to compression, and appears to focus on decompression functionality (see, e.g., columns 3-4 of *Necoechea*). Additionally, there is nothing to teach or suggest that a *plurality of data units* of a test data file are compressed using different compression techniques in the manner described in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over *Necoechea*, and respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over *Necoechea*, dependent claims 2-11 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-11 contain all elements of their respective base claim. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

## Independent Claim 12

Claim 12 recites (with emphasis added):

12. A method for adaptively compressing test data to be provided to a device under test (DUT), the method comprising the steps of:

examining a test data file that includes test data configured to enable testing the DUT, the test data file including a first plurality of data units and a second plurality of data units, the first plurality of data units corresponding to a first plurality of DUT pins, and the second plurality of data units corresponding to a second plurality of DUT pins;

*determining that the first plurality of data units have a first compressibility characteristic; and*

*determining that the second plurality of data units have a second compressibility characteristic.*

Applicant respectfully submits that *Necoechea* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the above-emphasized features. The Office Action cites reference characters 201 and 202, col. 3, lines 51-55, and col. 6, lines 6-15 of *Necoechea*. As explained above, reference characters 201 and 202 and the description in col. 3 of *Necoechea* appears to focus on the receipt of compressed data. Col. 6, lines 6-15 of *Necoechea* provides as follows:

Various types of decompression algorithms may be used to decompress the compressed test pattern data units. Examples include GZIP, proprietary decompression algorithms as well as others not listed above. The decompression engine 302 decompresses the compressed test pattern data units that correspond to at least part of those test patterns that, when decompressed, will be applied to at least one of the testing interfaces 330a through 330d managed by testing application logic 304.

Assuming *arguendo* that various types of decompression algorithms may be used in the system described in *Necoechea*, there is nothing in the above-cited section or elsewhere in *Necoechea* that discloses, teaches, or suggests the *determining* features as claimed or that *data units* from a *test data file* are somehow distinguished by their respective *compressibility characteristic*.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over *Necoechea*, and respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 12 be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 12 is allowable over *Necoechea*, dependent claims 13-16 are allowable as a matter of law.

### **Independent Claim 17**

Claim 17 recites (with emphasis added):

17. A system for adaptively compressing test data to be provided to a device under test (DUT), the system comprising:

memory configured to store a test data file that includes a first plurality of data units corresponding to a first plurality of DUT pins and a second plurality of data units corresponding to a second plurality of DUT pins; and

*a processor operative to:*

*compress the first plurality of data units using a first compression technique; and*

*compress the second plurality of data units using a second compression technique.*

For similar reasons expressed above in association with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that *Necoechea* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the above-emphasized features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable over *Necoechea*, and respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 17 be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 17 is allowable over *Necoechea*, dependent claims 18-27 are allowable as a matter of law.

## Independent Claim 28

Claim 28 recites (with emphasis added):

28. A system for adaptively compressing test data to be provided to a device under test (DUT), the system comprising:

memory configured to store a test data file that includes test data configured to enable testing the DUT, the test data file including a first plurality of data units and a second plurality of data units, the first plurality of data units corresponding to a first plurality of DUT pins, and the second plurality of data units corresponding to a second plurality of DUT pins; and

*a processor that is operative to:*

*determine that the first plurality of data units have a first compressibility characteristic;*

*determine that the second plurality of data units have a second compressibility characteristic.*

For similar reasons expressed above in association with claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that *Necoechea* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the above-emphasized features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 is allowable over *Necoechea*, and respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 28 be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 28 is allowable over *Necoechea*, dependent claims 29-32 are allowable as a matter of law.

Due to the shortcomings of the *Necoechea* reference described in the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Necoechea* does not anticipate Applicant's claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

---

  
/dr/  
Dave Rodack  
Registration No. 47,034

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1750  
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500